

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                              | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.    | CONFIRMATION NO.        |  |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 10/608,076                                   | 06/30/2003      | Brian M. Novack      | P23663                 | P23663 7858             |  |
| 7055   | 7590 08/02/2006 | EXAMINER             |                        |                         |  |
| GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.                |                 |                      | HONG, HARRY S          |                         |  |
| 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE<br>RESTON, VA 20191 |                 |                      | ART UNIT               | PAPER NUMBER            |  |
| 11251011,                                    |                 |                      | 2614                   |                         |  |
|  |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 08/02/200 | DATE MAILED: 08/02/2006 |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)                |  |  |  |
|---|---|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Office Action Cummons   | 10/608,076  | NOVACK, BRIAN M.            |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner  | Art Unit                    |  |  |  |
|   | Harry S. Hong   | 2614                        |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply  |   |                             |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |   |                             |  |  |  |
| Status  |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 Ap  | oril 2006.  |                             |  |  |  |
| ·_ ·  |   |                             |  |  |  |
| · <u> </u>  | ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is |                             |  |  |  |
|   | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.                 |                             |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 4) Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.  |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  |   |                             |  |  |  |
| <u></u>   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  |   |                             |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.  |   |                             |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |   |                             |  |  |  |
| · ·   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| a) All b) Some * c) None of:  |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  |   |                             |  |  |  |
|   |   |                             |  |  |  |
|   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)   |   |                             |  |  |  |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da  | (PTO-413)                   |  |  |  |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  |   | atent Application (PTO-152) |  |  |  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date   | 6)  Other:  | ·                           |  |  |  |

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1-4 and 6-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Blackburn et al. (US 7,012,998 B1; cited and applied for the first time).

With respect to the independent claims 1, 6, 7, 14, and 19, the claimed invention reads on Blackburn as follows. The claimed first intelligent peripheral reads on the voice-messaging platform 110 (see column 3, line 18 - 20). The claimed receiver that receives a call from the calling party has to be most basic and inherent to the voice messaging platform since that is the natural function of any voice messaging platform (see also column 2, lines 1 - 6; column 3, lines 4 - 8; and column 4, lines 22 - 24). With respect to the claimed determiner or determining step, see column 4, lines 25 - 29 and lines 56 - 65. The claimed second intelligent peripheral reads on intelligent peripheral 140. And, the claimed establishing a call connection with the second intelligent peripheral is taught at column 4, lines 29 - 39.

As to claims 2, 8, 15, and 22, Blackburn teaches a call between the IVRs (column 4, lines 40 and 41) and hence, it would be inherent in any IVR system that it is

Application/Control Number: 10/608,076 Page 3

Art Unit: 2614

not an actual person speaking, hence the IVR system, therefore, it would have prerecorded/computer generated speech.

As to claims 3, 4, 9 - 12, 16, 17, 20, and 21, the claimed session information database reads on the internal storage device 125 of Blackburn.

As to claims 13 and 18, Blackburn inherently teaches a three-way call between the users (see Abstract), voice messaging platform 120, and intelligent peripheral 140.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackburn as applied above.

Voice over Internet protocol communications is now ubiquitous. Therefore, the claimed calling party comprising a computer processor inasmuch as a computer or some computer processor-based device would be needed to effect such communications would have been a clear design choice and would have been obvious even to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make such a choice.

Art Unit: 2614

## Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6, 7, 14, and 19 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry S. Hong whose telephone number is (571) 272-7485. The examiner is normally off on Wednesdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing F. Chan can be reached on (571) 272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Harry S. Hong Primary Examiner Art Unit 2614

July 31, 2006